

REMARKS

Claims 68-93 are currently pending in the application. Of these claims, claims 68 and 87 are independent.

Claim Objections

In the Office Action, claims 72 and 77 are objected to because "main memory" purportedly lacks antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully traverses these objections.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 72 and 77 do not lack antecedent basis for "main memory" because they do not refer to "the" or "said" main memory. Indeed, Applicant notes that all examples lacking antecedent basis in MPEP § 2173.05(e) refer to "the" or "said". Applicant respectfully submits that the recitation of "main memory" does not render claims 72 and 77 indefinite as the scope of these claims would be reasonably ascertainable by those skilled in the art.

Also in the Office Action, claims are objected to because they refer to an industry standard. Applicant respectfully traverses these objections.

Applicant respectfully disagrees that reference to an industry standard in a claim renders the claim vague and indefinite. In the interest of expediting prosecution, however, Applicant has amended independent claims 68 and 87 to refer to Revision 2 of the Advanced Configuration and Power Interface Specification.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim objections in the Office Action have been overcome and should accordingly be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph

In the Office Action, claims 68-86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph as being indefinite because claim 68 is purportedly incomplete for omitting an identified entry time.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicant initially notes that claim 76, which depends from independent claim 68, recites identification of a time corresponding to an entry of a processor into a C power state. Noting

that claims 77-80 depend from claim 76, Applicant respectfully submits that the basis for these rejections are not applicable to claims 76-80.

Applicant also respectfully notes that an identified entry time is not necessary for independent claim 68. As one example of an embodiment covered by claim 68, a counter can be started from a count of zero in response to identifying entry of a processor into a C power state, and the counter can then later be read for a time corresponding to an exit of the processor from the C power state. Indeed, claim 84, which depends from claim 68, explicitly covers starting of a counter, and claims 81-83, each of which depend from claim 68, explicitly cover reading a counter.

For at least the above reasons and noting that claims 69-75 and 85-86 also depend from independent claim 68, Applicant respectfully submits that these rejections have been overcome and should accordingly be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

In the Office Action, claims 68-93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 68-93 are directed to statutory subject matter because the methods of independent claims 68 and 87 are each tied to a particular machine.

Independent claim 68 refers to a processor that enters into and exits from a C power state in accordance with Advanced Configuration and Power Interface (ACPI) Specification, Revision 2, wherein the processor exits from the C power state in response to an interrupt and wherein the processor executes an interrupt routine in response to the interrupt. Applicant respectfully submits that such a processor constitutes a particular machine.

Independent claim 87 refers to a processor that enters into and exits from a C power state in accordance with Advanced Configuration and Power Interface (ACPI) Specification, Revision 2. Claim 87 also refers to a counter. Applicant respectfully submits that such a processor and counter constitute a particular machine.

For at least the above reasons and noting that claims 69-86 and 88-93 depend from independent claim 68 or 87, Applicant respectfully submits that these rejections have been overcome and should accordingly be withdrawn.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to help expedite the prosecution of this patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 19, 2010

/Matthew C. Fagan, Reg. No. 37,542/

Matthew C. Fagan
Registration No. 37,542
Telephone: (512) 732-3936
Facsimile: (512) 732-3912 (please call first)

Intel Corporation
c/o CPA Global
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Page 8 of 8

U.S. APPLICATION NO. 10/830,201
ATTORNEY'S DOCKET NO. 42P12974C